

University of Windsor Scholarship at UWindsor

History Publications

Department of History

2005

David McKitterick. New worlds for learning, 1873-1972, vol 3 of a history of Cambridge University Press.

Leslie Howsam
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/historypub>

 Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Howsam, Leslie. (2005). David McKitterick. New worlds for learning, 1873-1972, vol 3 of a history of Cambridge University Press.. *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (4), 868-870.
<http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/historypub/1>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

The Journal of British Studies

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JBR>

Additional services for *The Journal of British Studies*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



David McKitterick. *New Worlds for Learning, 1873–1972*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Cambridge University Press*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. 513. \$170.00 (cloth).

Leslie Howsam

The Journal of British Studies / Volume 44 / Issue 04 / October 2005, pp 868 - 870

DOI: 10.1086/497490, Published online: 21 December 2012

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0021937100009163

How to cite this article:

Leslie Howsam (2005). The Journal of British Studies, 44, pp 868-870 doi:10.1086/497490

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

first time. This repetition occurs even in the last two essays on imperialism, both of which were written for this volume. Both essays argue that “empire was seen as a projection of masculinity” (193), but the second of these two essays, chapter 9 (“Manliness, Masculinities and the New Imperialism, 1880–1900”), does not acknowledge that this idea has already been explored in detail in the previous chapter. Given the origins of the book, I do not know how to remedy the problem, at least in the first two-thirds of the book, but it catches the reader up short each time.

With the exception of the last two essays on empire, those who have read Tosh’s recent *A Man’s Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven, CT, 1999) or his contributions to the volume he edited with Michael Roper, *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (London, 1991) will be familiar with the arguments here. For example, the argument made at greater length in *A Man’s Place*, that by the late nineteenth century domesticity was becoming less appealing to middle-class Englishmen, is made more briefly in chapter 5, “Middle-Class Masculinities in the Era of the Women’s Suffrage Movement, 1860–1914.” A related argument, that fatherhood was less appealing and less useful as a way of achieving a masculine identity, which is put forth at greater length in *A Man’s Place*, is found in chapter 6, “Authority and Nurture in Middle-Class Fatherhood: The Case of Early and Mid-Victorian England.” Nevertheless, this would be a useful collection for an upper-level university class on nineteenth-century England. Notwithstanding that its subject is masculinity, it would also be a useful text for a class on gender in nineteenth-century England, for there is enough basic information about women that, with some fill-in lectures by the instructor, this book would work. The main stumbling block to ordering this book for what seems to be its intended audience of advanced undergraduates is its price: \$32 is a bit high for a paperback collection of previously published essays.

Carol Marie Engelhardt, Wright State University

DAVID MCKITTERICK. *New Worlds for Learning, 1873–1972*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Cambridge University Press*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. 513. \$170.00 (cloth).

This third and “for the present” (xv) final volume of David McKitterick’s history of the University Press at Cambridge is an account of scholarly publishing, set against the backdrop of dramatic changes in the world of higher education in the century between 1873 and 1972. The book incorporates the intellectual and cultural, as well as the commercial, aspects of publishing as practiced by one of the two ancient universities of England. Readers of McKitterick’s brilliant and polemical *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (an expansion of his Lyell Lectures, also published at Cambridge in 2004) will not be surprised at the strong emphasis on printing as part of the history of a university publisher. Indeed the opening paragraphs of the first chapter, which describes “a century of change,” exhaustively address paper, type, illustration, and binding. Only after these core subjects are thoroughly covered does McKitterick enter into such questions as university reform, changing practices of the book trades, and the dynamics of an international publishing business.

The very structure of the book reflects not only the author’s commitment to printing and book design, but also the trajectory of the press through the period. In the 1870s, the Cambridge University Press was more important as a printer than as a publisher. Orders for printing—from the university for examination papers, from other publishers for typographical challenges like mathematics, and from the various organizations and businesses that supplied

the ubiquitous Bible trade—took precedence over the nurturing and dissemination of scholarship. A whole chapter is devoted to Macmillan, the London firm that dominated scholarly publishing in both Cambridge and Oxford for decades. Changes began in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, as new academic disciplines (notably history) entered the academy and came to the attention of its publishers. The *Cambridge Modern History* was a major project of the 1890s and 1900s; it was followed by further multivolume collaborative histories, of English literature, of the medieval and ancient worlds, and of the British Empire, among others. McKitterick characterizes 1900–1916 as “a difficult period,” not only because the First World War meant that German contributors to the *Cambridge Medieval History* had become enemy aliens, but because the Bible business was in decline, and because a massive investment in Monotype equipment became necessary. The press was central to the typographical renaissance of the 1920s and 1930s, when Walter Lewis and Stanley Morison transformed the practices of typography and book design. The war years 1939–45 were hard, with both authors and staff away on military service, paper severely rationed, and the habits of the reading public becoming unstable. In the postwar decades, the benefits to the press of rapidly expanding education systems (and hence markets for textbooks and monographs) all over the world competed with the hardships imposed by wage and price controls and later by inflation. By the 1970s, however, the press had become an internationally known and respected publisher, with a flourishing New York branch, and its printing operation had been made an independent unit.

Like its predecessors, *New Worlds for Learning* is an authoritative and comprehensive volume, organized to meet the needs of several constituencies. Not all of these readers will require a history of the press for its own sake. Those interested in the history of scholarly publishing in Britain will welcome an account that is much fuller than Peter Sutcliffe’s pointedly titled *The Oxford University Press: An Informal History* (1978). This history is a formal one, thoroughly documented but still a compelling narrative with its share of evocative anecdotes. When we learn that the travelers working in the Bible department of Cambridge’s London warehouse before 1914 were known for “noisy camaraderie” and for dressing in frock coats and silk top hats, the latter “regularly ironed so as to remain fresh,” we are alert and prepared for the assertion, equally counterintuitive, that “the Bible trade was often vicious” (219). Another group of readers will merely consult McKitterick’s volumes for valuable background knowledge of the publishing careers of Cambridge authors in the sciences, in mathematics, and in the humanities, or for accounts of major collaborative projects like the Revised Version of the Bible, the *Cambridge Modern History*, or the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Both of these broad readership categories will be grateful for the service McKitterick and the press have offered to scholarship by making this detailed narrative history available.

McKitterick aims to set his story in the context of Cambridge University (and other universities), of schools, of rival publishers, of rival printers, and of learned societies. It is an intensely local history, and the attentive reader will learn much about the politics of Cambridge, its colleges, and its booksellers. The reader must also come to terms with the London face of the press at Bentley House and the often fraught relationships between Cambridge and London. But “Cambridge” has a global and transnational meaning, too, and this account shows how the gentleman-scholars of a very old university learned to work with their authors, their customers, and their publishing counterparts in the United States and in various parts of the British Empire, both English-speaking and otherwise.

The archives of the Cambridge University Press, housed in the University Library, form the basis of this account of printing and book design mingled with scholarship and with marketing. McKitterick notes in the preface that the press archives are more than ten times what had been listed by Elisabeth Leedham-Green in her *Guide to the Archives of the Cambridge University Press* (Bishops Stortford, Chadwyck Healey, 1973). They are of course incomplete, especially from the London branch of the business, but enough remains for a

detailed picture to be built up. Unlike the earlier volumes, this one also takes advantage of interviews with retired and active members of the press staff whose memories supplement the archival record.

Leslie Howsam, University of Windsor (Canada)

ANN C. COLLEY. *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Colonial Imagination*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. Pp. 217. \$79.95 (cloth).

Titles are tricky things, and I sympathize with Ann C. Colley in the difficulty of titling this work. One feels that the word “missionary” should be in there somewhere, as the book frames Stevenson within missionary culture. Yet presumably the word “colonial” in an academic book title attracts more readers than the word “missionary.” “Stevenson, the Missionaries, and the Colonial Imagination” is starting to sound like a shopping list but better conveys the book’s triple focus, in which nineteenth-century missionary culture is treated as an object of study in its own right, the main vector of colonialism in the Pacific, and an important and pervasive influence on Stevenson and his writing.

In analyzing this influence, Colley challenges the coherence of the anti-imperialist Stevenson championed by literary critics (myself included) over the past fifteen years. Appealing as this figure is to postcolonial minds it does not, Colley claims, tell the whole story. If we trace Stevenson’s varying, ambivalent, and often self-contradictory responses to different missionaries, missionary practices, colonial agents, and imperial acts, we see that he is both critic and son of empire, as he is both critic and son of the missionary faith, and that he often found strategic value and emotional solace in ideas of which he was, on occasion, a trenchant critic. If there is an underlying belief to this book, it is that nothing is ever one thing, and neither imperialism, nor missionary culture, nor Stevenson’s imaginative response to them, can be reduced to a monolithic entity. “One must not look for a system or a universal, but, instead, for the shifting tones of the particular experiences, as one voice or circumstance replaces another” (7). Colley argues that we should not impose general ideological structures on multivalent experiences and texts, but rather attend to particularity, shift, and nuance, and this approach produces a book that is a series of essays, not a sustained thesis. Colley looks at various interfaces of the missionary world with Stevenson’s life and writings, giving full rein to the play of mind—Stevenson’s and her own—over such subjects as “remembrance, alienation, images, language, and power” (2).

The standout chapters are, for me, “Stevenson’s Pyjamas” and “Lighting Up the Darkness.” Each takes an aspect of material culture and explores its meanings for Stevenson within the complex engagements of islanders, missionaries, travelers, and colonialists in the nineteenth-century Pacific. In “Stevenson’s Pyjamas,” Colley discusses the significance of various forms of “undress” in which Stevenson and his family engaged (such as wearing pajamas and walking barefoot), and which were regarded by contemporaries as evidence of “going native.” Against this, she notes the function of clothes as boundary markers, signifiers of salvation, and symbols of colonial authority, a function regularly invoked by missionaries and, often, by Stevenson himself. A third mode of engaging with clothes, “dressing up,” is perhaps the most interesting of all. Colley looks at a number of ways in which the Stevensons indulged in the play and performance of dressing up, including the tartan “livery” Stevenson designed for his household staff in Samoa, cross-cultural dressing, and dressing themselves and others for the camera. In “Lighting Up the Darkness,” which takes the camera as its explicit subject, Colley relates the photography in which the Stevenson party were so keenly involved to the magic lantern shows used by missionaries as a tool for religious education and, at the same time, to project an imperial worldview. More broadly, she com-